



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,705	02/11/2004	Tamar Eilam	YOR9 20040031US1	3451
7590 03/07/2008				
Louis P. Herzberg Intellectual Property Law Dept. IBM Corporation P.O. Box 218 Yorktown Heights, NY 10598				
EXAMINER				
KRISHNAN, VIVEK V				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2145				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/07/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/776,705

**Applicant(s)**

EILAM ET AL.

**Examiner**

VIVEK KRISHNAN

**Art Unit**

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to the Amendment/Arguments filed on January 3, 2008.

Claims 1-14 and 16-21 are pending. Claim 15 has been cancelled.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments and amendments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Drawing Objections under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of Figure 2 has been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments and amendments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Drawing Objections under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections of Figures 2 and 5 have been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments and amendments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Drawing Objections under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of Figure 5 has been withdrawn.
4. Applicant's arguments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Objections to the Specification under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP 608.01(o), in regards to Claim 4, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of the specification in regards to Claim 4 has been withdrawn.

5. Applicant's arguments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Objections to the Specification under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP 608.01(o), in regards to Claim 11, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. ...the claim 11 element "generating a resource manager" is supported by both Fig. 2, and the written description in the paragraph beginning at line 11 of page 6, which describes Resource Managers (RMs) thoroughly and readily ascertainable...

Examiner asserts that it remains unclear in view of the specification and figures the how the resource manager is generated.

6. Applicant's arguments and amendments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Claim Objections under 37 CFR 1.75(c) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections of Claims 16 and 18 have been withdrawn.

7. Applicant's arguments and amendments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Claim Objections regarding informalities have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections of Claims 2, 6-9, 12, 14, and 19 have been withdrawn.

8. Applicant's arguments and amendments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of Claim 18 has been withdrawn.

9. Applicant's arguments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

b. ...applicant does not find a method or apparatus for provisioning in a computing utility infrastructure comprising (means for) obtaining a Concrete Resource Model describing a desired resource structure; and (means for) using the Concrete Resource Model to generate at least one provisioning action to create a matching resource structure in the computing utility infrastructure at Osborn's col. 3, lines 60-67.

Examiner asserts that Osborn discloses an abstract resource description, or Concrete Resource Model, describing virtual hardware resource objects which identify application hardware requirements (Osborn; Figure 2, column 3 lines 60-67, and column 4 lines 1-15); and using the abstract resource description to create a matching resource structure (Osborn; Figure 2, column 3 lines 60-67, and column 4 lines 1-15). It is inherent for an operating system, as disclosed by Osborn, to generate at least one task, or provisioning action, to create the matching resource structure.

10. Applicant's arguments, filed January 3, 2008, with respect to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

c. ...because claims 2, 3, 7, 8 and 19, depend from claim 1, and because claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Osborn as set forth above in the response to the rejection of claim 1 in view of Osborn under Section 102(e), combining Porter with Osborn still would not realize an invention as set forth in claims 2, 3, 7, 8 and 19. Hence, these claims are patentable under section

103(a) by Osborn combined with Porter for at least the reasons set forth for the patentability of independent claim 1 in view of Osborn under Section 102(e).

Examiner asserts that in view of the aforementioned argument that Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 17, Applicant's argument is moot.

### ***Specification***

11. Claims are objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

"generating a Resource Manager" as disclosed in claim 11. Neither the claims nor the specification provide sufficient disclosure for how a Resource Manager is generated.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1, 11, 15-18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,050,807 to Osborn (hereinafter "Osborn").

14. As to Claims 1 and 17, Osborn discloses a method and apparatus (referenced hereinafter as the method) for provisioning in a computing utility infrastructure, the method comprising:

obtaining a Concrete Resource Model describing a desired resource structure (Osborn; Figure 2, column 3 lines 60-67, and column 4 lines 1-15, discloses obtaining an abstract resource description describing virtual hardware resource objects which identify application hardware requirements); and

using the Concrete Resource Model to generate at least one provisioning action to create a matching resource structure in the computing utility infrastructure (Osborn; Figure 2, column 3 lines 60-67, and column 4 lines 1-15, discloses using the abstract resource description to create a matching resource structure, by mapping available hardware resources to the abstract resource description. It is inherent for an operating system, as disclosed by Osborn, to generate at least one task, or provisioning action, to create the matching resource structure.).

15. As to Claim 11, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. Osborn further discloses employing said Concrete Resource Model to generate a Resource Manager for a composite resource (Osborn; column 6 lines 3-20, column 7 lines 1-25, and Figure 8, discloses that a hardware resource manager employs the application

hardware resource specification and a hardware resource diagram, which represents a composite resource, to allocate the composite resource and thereby create a resource manager for the composite resource).

16. As to Claim 16, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. Osborn further discloses a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform method steps for provisioning in a computing utility infrastructure, said method steps comprising the steps of claim 1 (Osborn; column 3 lines 44-67, column 4 lines 1-15, column 7 lines 35-45, and Figure 2, discloses implementation on a hardware system comprising code to implement the provisioning).

17. As to Claim 18, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 17. Osborn further discloses a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing provisioning in a computing utility infrastructure, the computer readable program code means in said computer program product comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 17 (Osborn; column 3 lines 44-67, column 4 lines 1-15, column 7 lines 35-45, and Figure 2, discloses implementation on a hardware system comprising code to implement the provisioning).

18. As to Claim 20, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. Osborn further discloses wherein the steps of obtaining and using are performed by at least one user taken from a group of users consisting of:



a service provider;

an enterprise owning an infrastructure used for running at least one application (Osborn; column 3 lines 1-15 and column 8 lines 12-23, discloses an application developer);

a customer of a service provider;

a company owning an IT infrastructure (Osborn; column 3 lines 1-15 and column 8 lines 12-23, discloses an application developer); and

a utility provider (Osborn; column 3 lines 1-15 and column 8 lines 12-23, discloses an application developer).

19. As to Claim 21, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 20. Osborn further discloses wherein at least one of said at least one user provides operational constraints dictating acceptable variations (Osborn; column 3 lines 1-15 and lines 60-67, discloses the application specification, provided by the application developer, that provides operational constraints).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborn, as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,332,023 B1 to Porter et al. (hereinafter "Porter").

22. As to Claim 2, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. Osborn further discloses wherein the step of using the Concrete Resource Model includes executing at least one phase comprised of a matching step, wherein the step of matching is repeated until the Concrete Resource Model is entirely matched with a set of at least one Resource Instance Service in a knowledge subsystem describing resources and organization of resources in the computing facility infrastructure (Osborn; column 6 lines 65-67 and column 7 lines 1-25 and Figure 8, discloses that using the abstract resource description, or application hardware resource specification, includes matching the application hardware resource specification with the hardware resource diagram).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose, but Porter discloses a configuring step as recited in the claim (Porter; column 3 lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Osborn's disclosure of a matching step to include a configuring step in order to provide for a more flexible allocation of resources (Porter; column 2 lines 35-54).

23. As to Claim 3, Osborn and Porter in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 2. Osborn further discloses wherein the step of matching includes

mapping every node in a subset of nodes in the Concrete Resource Model to a Resource Instance Service in the knowledge subsystem, such that for every node in said subset, constraints on values of fixed attributes in said node are satisfied by the values of the same attributes in the corresponding Resource Instance Service, and the set of fixed relationships between matched nodes matches the set of relationships between the corresponding Resource Instance Services (Osborn; Figure 8, Figure 9, column 6 lines 45-67, and column 7 lines 1-25, discloses matching the application hardware resource specification to the hardware resource diagram by parsing the definitions and constraints of the application hardware resource specification that include information regarding fixed attributes and relationships).

24. As to Claim 7, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. In addition, Osborn and Porter in combination disclose wherein the step of generating at least one provisioning action includes at least one task taken from a group of tasks consisting of:

creating a new service environment (Osborn; column 3 lines 60-67, discloses allocating resources to an application to create a service environment);

changing a combination of resources allocated to the service environment (Osborn; column 3 lines 60-67, discloses allocating resources to an application to create a service environment) (Porter; column 3 lines 40-50, discloses de-allocating resources allocated to a service environment);

changing the configuration of resources allocated to a service environment (Porter; column 3 lines 30-40, discloses changing the configuring of a resource that has been allocated to a service environment);

destroying a service environment; and

any combination of these tasks.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Osborn's disclosure of provisioning to include the ability to change the configuration of resources in order to provide for a more flexible allocation of resources (Porter; column 2 lines 35-54).

25. As to Claim 8, Osborn and Porter in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 7. Porter further discloses wherein changing the configuration of resources allocated to a service environment includes at least one of:

changing a local state of a resource (Porter; column 1 lines 66-67, column 3 lines 1-20, discloses updating static and dynamic resource attributes); and

changing a way the resource is configured to work with other resources.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Osborn's disclosure of provisioning to include the ability to change the configuration of resources in order to provide for a more flexible allocation of resources (Porter; column 2 lines 35-54).

26. As to Claim 19, Osborn and Porter in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 2, Osborn further discloses wherein said at least one phase is a

Concrete Model Processing Engine phase, the Concrete Model Processing Engine phase, comprising:

receiving requests in the form of a Concrete Resource Model describing a desired resource structure (Osborn; column 3 lines 60-67, discloses a hardware resource manager that receives requests in the form of an abstract resource description describing virtual hardware resource objects which identify application hardware requirements); and

generating provisioning actions for reaching a state that satisfies the requirements specified in the Concrete Resource Model (Osborn; column 3 lines 60-67, discloses the hardware resource manager creating a matching resource structure to satisfy the requirements of the abstract resource description).

27. Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborn and Porter, as applied to Claim 2 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,980,824 to Tulpule et al. (hereinafter "Tulpule"), and U.S. Patent No. 4,648,031 to Jenner (hereinafter "Jenner").

28. As to Claim 4, Osborn and Porter in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 2. Neither Osborn nor Porter explicitly disclose, but Tulpule discloses wherein the step of configuring includes:

collecting provisioning actions to a provisioning action set (Tulpule; column 2 lines 55-65, discloses collecting tasks to a queue);

selecting a provisioning action having all preconditions satisfied (Tulpule; column 2 lines 55-65 and column 3 lines 24-26, discloses selecting tasks having all prerequisites met);

executing the provisioning action (Tulpule; column 3 lines 24-26, discloses executing the tasks); and

repeating the steps of selecting and executing until all provisioning actions whose preconditions are satisfied are executed (Tulpule; column 3 lines 24-26, discloses selecting tasks whose prerequisites are satisfied for placement in a queue for execution).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Osborn and Porter's disclosure of a configuring step to include collecting, selecting, and executing tasks for provisioning in order to provide a task executive that takes into account task dependencies and prerequisites (Tulpule; column 2 lines 23-34).

Tulpule does not explicitly disclose, but Jenner discloses and updating the knowledge subsystem with side effects of the provisioning action (Jenner; column 2 lines 4-10, discloses a recovery log that is updated with side effect information of a task).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tulpule's disclosure of executing the task to include updating the system with the side effects of the task in order to facilitate system recovery (Jenner; column 1 lines 55-65).

29. As to Claim 6, Osborn, Porter, Tulpule, and Jenner in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 4. Jenner further discloses obtaining said side effects of said provisioning action by at least one of:

inspecting the definition of said provisioning action in said knowledge subsystem;  
and

dynamically discovering the side effects once the action is executed by executing a discovery component (Jenner; column 2 lines 4-10, discloses a recovery log that is updated with side effect information when a task is executed).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tulpule's disclosure of executing the task to include updating the system with the side effects of the task in order to facilitate system recovery (Jenner; column 1 lines 55-65).

30. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborn and Porter, as applied to Claim 2 above, in further view of Tulpule.

31. As to Claim 5, Osborn and Porter in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 2. Neither Osborn nor Porter explicitly disclose, but Tulpule discloses, wherein the step of configuring includes

selecting a provisioning action from a provisioning action set having at least one precondition not satisfied (Tulpule; Figure 4, Figure 5, and column 12 lines 29-47,

discloses dependency table and prerequisite table that are used to determine tasks with preconditions satisfied and tasks without preconditions satisfied),

finding a different action to satisfy said at least one precondition (Tulpule; column 12 lines 29-47, discloses selecting a different task that satisfies the prerequisite); and

adding said different action to said provisioning action set (Tulpule; column 12 lines 29-47, discloses selecting a different task that satisfies the prerequisite and placing the task in a queue for execution).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Osborn and Porter's disclosure of a configuring step to include providing a task to satisfy the preconditions of another task in a set in order to provide a task executive that takes into account task dependencies and prerequisites (Tulpule; column 2 lines 23-34).

32. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborn, as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0128397 A1 to Glasmann et al. (hereinafter "Glasmann").

33. As to Claim 9, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. Osborn does not explicitly disclose, but Glasmann discloses regenerating provisioning instructions whenever at least one of the following occurs:

infrastructure characteristics change (Glasmann; paragraph 5, 8, and 9, discloses allocating resources when there is a change in the topology); and requirements of the service change; and



Provider's policy change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Osborn's disclosure of provisioning resources to include providing resources when infrastructure characteristics change in order to provide for adaptive resource checking and reacting to topology changes (Glasmann; paragraphs 7 and 10).

34. As to Claim 10, Osborn and Glasmann in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 9. Glasmann further discloses wherein infrastructure characteristics are taken from a group of characteristics consisting of:

types of resources in the infrastructure;

capabilities of said resources (Glasmann; paragraphs 4 and 5, discloses topology changes include changes in the capabilities of a resource);

configuration of said resources (Glasmann; paragraphs 4 and 5, discloses topology changes include changes in the configuration of a resource);

constraints on a configuration of said resources; and

any combination of these characteristics.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Osborn's disclosure of provisioning resources to include providing resources when infrastructure characteristics change in order to provide for adaptive resource checking and reacting to topology changes (Glasmann; paragraphs 7 and 10).

35. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborn, as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,446 B2 to Chellis et al. (hereinafter "Chellis").

36. As to Claim 12, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. Osborn does not explicitly disclose, but Chellis discloses wherein said concrete resource model provides a set of resource manager methods taken from a group of resource manager methods consisting of:

creating composite resources based on a Concrete Resource Model (As mentioned above, Osborn does disclose a resource manager for a composite resource. Chellis; column 3 lines 36-59, discloses a resource manager capable of creating a composite resource, or set of interdependent resources, based on defined resource requirements for a service);

changing composite resources based on a Concrete Resource Model (As mentioned above, Osborn does disclose a resource manager for a composite resource. Chellis; column 3 lines 36-67 column 4 lines 1-27 and column 9 lines 55-67, discloses a resource manager capable of changing a composite resource, or set of interdependent resources, based on defined resource requirements for a service);

destroying composite resources based on a Concrete Resource Model; and  
any combination of these resource manager methods.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in Osborn's disclosure of a resource manager the ability to create and change composite resources in order to provide increased functionality to the

resource manager and, in addition, to provide for more robust allocation of composite resources (Chellis; column 2 lines 44-67 and column 3 lines 1-6).

37. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborn, as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,151,984 to Newman et al. (hereinafter "Newman").

38. As to Claim 13, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. Osborn does not explicitly disclose, but Newman discloses wherein the step of using is executed according to an execution specification (Newman; column 53 lines 6-10, discloses a specification for execution).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Osborn's disclosure of the step of using to include executing according to an execution specification in order to control how the step of using is executed.

39. As to Claim 14, Osborn discloses each and every limitation of Claim 1. Osborn does not explicitly disclose, but Newman discloses wherein said execution specification is taken from a group of execution specifications consisting of:

execute immediately (Newman; discloses executing code immediately, see column 53 lines 6-10);

stored and executed later at least once (Newman; discloses storing and executing later, see column 53 lines 6-10); and

a combination of the above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Osborn's disclosure of the step of using to include executing according to an execution specification in order to control how the step of using is executed.

### ***Conclusion***

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIVEK KRISHNAN whose telephone number is (571) 270-5009. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

VK

/Jason D Cardone/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145